

identity could form in the same way through contact with an 'ethnically different' group. To support his argument, Hall claims that the 'colonisation movement' (a term which Hall admits is problematic but retains for the sake of convention) was not an important element in the realisation of Hellenic identity, since he states (p. 91) that, if it were, the Greeks would have to have seen non-Greeks as a 'mirror' 'in which Greek settlers might contemplate their own specificity', that such an awareness of difference (with a resultant awareness of similarity) would have to be disseminated quickly through the Mediterranean 'to construct a singular Hellenic consciousness', and that 'the watershed for this process was the eighth century'.

We will return to the question of timing shortly, but first we need to deal with the issue of difference. Hall analyses Greek contacts with non-Greeks in 'colonial' contexts, concentrating on Sicily and southern Italy and suggests that originally there was not necessarily perceived to be much difference culturally between the newcomers and the indigenous peoples (pp. 91–97). However, while Hall is right to reject a 'simplistic core-periphery model' (p. 121), the experience in Sicily was not necessarily the experience elsewhere.

In the East the Greeks came into contact with mature cultures with developed cultural traditions. Contact with the outside world through Cyprus was reinvigorated in the 10th century (if indeed it had ever been broken), and by the 8th century the Greeks had developed substantial contacts with the East, whether through trading connections with the Phoenicians, travel to and settlement in Egypt and the Levantine littoral, or contact with Phoenician settlers in Cyprus, Pithekoussai and the Greek mainland.²²

In Egypt, the Greeks thought of themselves as outsiders. Greeks and Carians from Asia Minor had probably been involved in Egypt as mercenaries since the 7th century, had started settling in Egypt perhaps as early as the late 7th century but certainly by the early 6th century,²³ and in the Archaic period Egypt was forming in the Greek imagination as ancient, exotic, and Other.²⁴ Although Hall points to a degree of assimilation of the Greek mercenary communities in Egypt (p. 119), these Greeks were also aware of differences in language between themselves and the Egyptians. Significantly, in an inscription dating to the early 6th century, Greek mercenaries describe themselves as *alloglossoi*, those of a different language (Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 7(4) a; cf. Hdt. 2. 154. 4). That the Greeks were generally considered to be—and felt themselves to be—outsiders in Egypt seems to be confirmed by Amasis' regularisation of Naukratis as a Greek settlement in Egypt (Hdt. 2. 178).²⁵

Elsewhere, the negotiation of difference was more complex. As Hall concedes, the poets of Asia Minor found in Lydia, on the one hand, wealth and *exotica* which they

²² For Phoenician craftsmen in Greece, see Coldstream 1982; S.P. Morris 1992, 124–49; Boardman 1999, 56–62. For a more cautious assessment of the evidence, see Hoffman 1997. Greeks and Phoenicians at Pithekoussai: Ridgway 1992, 111–18; Coldstream 1993, 95. Greeks working with Phoenicians: Ridgway 1990; 1992, 20–30; 1994; Boardman 1990; Anbet 1993, 314–16. Greeks travelling and trading in the Mediterranean: Boardman 1990. For scepticism about the level of Greek involvement at Al Mina and elsewhere, see Graham 1986; 1990, 53; Negbi 1992; Snodgrass 1994; Papadopoulos 1997.

²³ Austin 1970, 15–34; Braun 1982, 36.

²⁴ See Hartog 2001, 41–77.

²⁵ For the Greeks at Naukratis, see Austin 1970, 22–33; Braun 1982, 37–43; Boardman 1999, 117–32.

aspired to, and, on the other, despicable luxury.²⁶ The Greeks of Asia Minor found in the Lydians 'difference', even if not Absolute Otherness—a difference founded not only on lifestyle but also in the late 7th century sharpened by military dominance (Mimnermus fr. 14 West^{ev}; Hdt. 1. 14–19. 1) and in the 6th century by conquest (Hdt. 1. 26–28).

Sometimes the 'edges' that marked difference could only be found as they were articulated. Homi Bhabha, in the context of the development of the pluralistic nation-space, talks about the intervals of contestation at the edges of identity, where the internally developed sense of the self is in a constant and shifting dialogue with externally induced sense of difference.²⁷ From a very early date, the communities of the Aegean desired Eastern *orientalia* (evidenced by finds at Lefkandi, Athens and Crete for example),²⁸ and items and practices derived from the East became significant for marking out and differentiating elite practices within communities. The significance of this 'Orientalising' was not that the Greeks borrowed, but that they adapted, Eastern artistic and literary idiom and transformed it so that through their engagement with another culture, they created their own cultural expressions—they created difference.²⁹

Yet although language and culture may have been a ways of finding difference, it does not mean—as Hall sets out—that they were also means of defining Hellenic identity. However, they did create a context in which the Hellenic identity could develop.³⁰ Hall says (p. 121): 'Greeks settlers cannot have failed to be aware of linguistic, cultural and perhaps even ethnic differences between themselves and the populations with whom they came into contact, but there is no evidence that they conceived of this difference in Hellenic (as opposed to civic, regional or sub-Hellenic) terms until well into the Classical period.' But that is to overlook the Hellenium at Naukratis.

The Hellenium was founded probably in the early 6th century for the gods of the Hellenes,³¹ and Herodotus says Amasis gave the Greeks this land so that they could have somewhere in Egypt to erect their own altars and temples (Hdt. 2. 178). While it is true that the foundation of the sanctuary was achieved by a small group of Greek states (and there is no indication that the Hellenium was necessarily a sanctuary for all Greeks), those Greeks involved in founding the Hellenium did recognise the existence of the Hellenic community and its gods, and expressed this recognition in terms of cult. It is also surely significant that this articulation of Hellenicity occurred in Egypt, a place where the Hellenes had identified themselves as not belonging, both in terms of language and in terms of cult (so that they felt the need for their own altars and temples). On this basis it is hard not to see the Hellenium as an identification and expression of the Hellenic community in the face of difference.

²⁶ See Kurke 1992; 1999, esp. 20, 185; I. Morris 2000, 178–85.

²⁷ Bhabha 1990, 297–302.

²⁸ Coldstream 1977, 55–65, 109–39; 1982; Boardman 1990; Ridgway 1992, 22–23; Popham 1994; S.P. Morris 1992, esp. 150–72; Osborne 1996, 40–51; Snodgrass 2000, 330–35.

²⁹ For the Eastern derivation of Greek literature and artistic idiom in the Archaic period, see esp. Burkert 1992; West 1966; 1997. For adaptation of Eastern idiom, see Boardman 1967, 73–108; 1998, 83–117; Osborne 1998, 43–51; Mitchell forthcoming.

³⁰ There are some indications in Homer that there was a sense of a single Hellenic language, but as Hall claims language is not used explicitly as a means of *defining* Hellenic identity as was to be the case in Herodotus and Thucydides.

³¹ Austin 1970, 22–24; Möller 2000, 106. Note also, however, Bowden 1996.

Herodotus also tells us that the Hellenium was built by the Ionians of Chios, Teos, Phocaea and Clazomenae, the Dorians of Rhodes, Cnidos, Harlicarnassus and Phaselis, and the Aeolians of Mytilene. As Hall himself has argued, the different subethnic identities of the Aeolian and Ionian communities of Asia Minor seem to have crystallised through contact with each other, and 'Ionian-ness' itself may have first been articulated in Asia Minor (pp. 67-73). It is also likely (as Hall points out) that the myths explaining the mainland origins of the communities of Asia Minor originated in Asia Minor. It is striking then that it is the communities of Asia Minor, whom we know felt the pressure of difference from their Eastern neighbours both at home in Asia Minor and in Egypt, who founded the Hellenium at Nancratis. This is not to say that it was the communities of Asia Minor who first articulated the community of the Hellenes, but that the founding of the Hellenium was an important moment of articulation of the Hellenic community.

At this point we need to return to Hall's insistence that if the 'colonisation' movement had an impact on the defining of Hellenic identity that we should see this in the 8th century. As Hall rightly notes, the Greek communities had been in contact with the non-Greek world long before the 8th century (pp. 91-97). But the process of finding and articulating difference through these early contacts must have been slow and tentative. As Hall argues, the *Odyssey*, a story which explores difference, is more concerned with the relationship between gods, monsters and men, than Greeks and non-Greeks as is sometimes claimed.³² Nevertheless, the *Odyssey* is a travel-story that probably reflects the finding of difference in the Greeks' own early travels in the Mediterranean (though not necessarily as early as the 10th century),³³ and was important for developing what Hartog has called a 'repertoire of Otherness'.³⁴

Indeed we should not expect an 'instantaneous' awareness of Hellenic identity in the 8th century, a single 'moment' when the Hellenic community was realised. What we see instead is a complex process. On the one hand, there was the rebuilding of contacts after the probable 'systems collapse' of the 12th and 11th centuries when populations declined and communities became impoverished and isolated, and a gradual but growing sense of shared culture through the development and dissemination of artistic *koinai* and poetic traditions, and the religious, cultural and civic value systems they represented and espoused. Together with the growing influence of cult centres, this cultural community created the conditions in which a Hellenic identity could be realised. At the same time, these pre-Hellenes were also coming into contact with those who had different cultural practices and values, whether in new 'colonial' situations or within their own communities. And while the sense of the community of the Hellenes was developing aggregatively, at the same time a growing sense of difference from those who did not share the same language and cultural practices was hardening. Out of an interaction between these two forces, one emphasising sameness and the other difference, Hellenic identity crystallised and Hellenic identity was realised.

A question remains regarding the mechanism(s) that allowed these forces (an internal and centrifugal force and an external pressure generated by an awareness of difference) to interact and crystallise into the self-conscious realisation of the Hellenic

³² Gods, beasts, men: Vidal-Naquet 1981; Hartog 2001, 15-36. 'Greeks and non-Greeks' in the *Odyssey* (most recently) Dougherty 2001.

³³ Malkin 1998.

³⁴ Hartog 2001, 21-36.